DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 407 95 RC 008 858

AUTHOR Streiff, Paul R.
TITLE School Management Options for American Indians.
INSTITUTION New Mexico State Univ., University Park. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 75
CONTRACT 400-75-0025
NOTE 55p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., 813 Airport Boulvard, Austin, Texas 78702 (Stock No. EC-030; $3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Community Involvement; Decision Making; *Educational Alternatives; *Educational Objectives; Federal Government; Information Dissemination; *Management; *Program Descriptions; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS BIA; Bureau of Indian Affairs; Combination Schools; Federal Schools; *Presidential Secretarial Educ Objective 1975; Tribal Private Schools Contract Schools

ABSTRACT

In response to the Presidential/Secretarial Educational Objective of 1975 which called for a statement from American Indian communities relative to their educational management preferences, the Office of Indian Education Programs (OIEP) established a program for gathering and disseminating educational management options to Indian people. A seven program series was developed by OIEP which included the following: (1) Introduction to the Series: Management Decisions in Indian Education; (2) Selecting Educational Goals and Assessing Educational Needs; (3) The Federal School; (4) The Public School; (5) The Tribal-Private School; (6) The Combination School; and (7) Another Look: It's Your Move (a review of all options). While 78 schools participated in the FY 1975 project, there has been a reluctance to officially determine community preferences as some people see the right to no decision as inherent in the definition of self-determination. Other Indian people are simply generally suspicious of any government program, believing the only real option to be that of the contract school which is perceived as just another avenue toward termination. Employing a more gradual approach to the transition period and allowing for an Indian definition of self-determination, the OIEP has extended the Objective through FY 1976 and has added 30 more schools to the project. (JC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED115407

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

BY

PAUL R. STREIFF, ED.D.

for

ERIC/CRESS

1975

RC 008 858

For Sale By
National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc.
813 Airport Boulevard Austin, Texas 78702
Stock No. EC-030
Price- $3.00

NOVEMBER 1975

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CLEARINGHOUSE ON RURAL EDUCATION AND SMALL SCHOOLS (CRESS)

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Indian Education Resources Center, Bureau of Indian Affairs, for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Indian Education Resources Center, Bureau of Indian Affairs, or the National Institute of Education.

The booklet may be duplicated in whole or in part, whenever such duplication is in the interest of bettering education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Background	3
	Indian Policy and Self-Determination	3
	Origins	3
	A New Era	5
III.	Objectives-Based Management in Government	8
	Department Level Responsibilities	8
	Bureau of Indian Affairs' Responsibilities	9
IV.	The Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Indian Education: Some Important Factors	10
	Self-Determination as Contracting: One Factor	10
	Indians Attending Public Schools: A second factor	12
	Uniqueness of Communities: A Third Factor	12
V.	Description of the Program	14
	Educational Objectives for Indians	14
	The Objective	16
	Approach	17
VI.	Operating Roles	21
VII.	Participating Area Offices	24
VIII.	The Informational Package	27
	A Brief Overview of the Informational Package	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
IX.	Plans and Strategies.	33
X.	The Objective is Revised.	35
XI.	FY 1975 in Retrospect	37
XII.	Summary and Conclusions	46
	Why Do We Have To Decide Anything?.	46
	Any Government Plan is Suspect.	48
	The Future of the Objective	48

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper will describe the development of plans, strategies, and materials in one of the Executive branches of the Federal Government, the Department of the Interior, toward systematic decision making in one of its major areas of responsibility: Indian Affairs.

More specifically, the program which will be described was developed by the Office of Indian Education programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1974. The program was designed to implement an objective of highest priority*. This objective called for Bureau of Indian Affairs' educators to assist Indian people to systematically reach informed decisions for themselves concerning the management of the federally operated schools their children now attend.

Two major aspects of this Bureau-wide program will be explained. The first will be the development and implementation of overall plans and strategies for accomplishing the objective. The second will deal with the design, production, distribution, and utilization of an instructional product; a seven parts filmstrip/audio tape series intended to assist in providing information to Indian people on school management options open to them.

*The Presidential/Secretarial objective for Indian education.

The information presented here should be of interest to local tribal leaders, Indian parents, Indian organizations and Indian educators who wish to know how to become better informed about school management options available to Indian people. These options, and the Bureau's program for informing Indian people about them, are part of the Federal Government's effort to carry out its official policy of Self-Determination by Indians in the management of their affairs.

II. BACKGROUND

Indian Policy and Self-Determination:

From the moment the United States first existed as an independent nation, it has had an "Indian Policy". Indian policy was of concern to the framers of the Constitution and of the Articles of Confederation before that. Every administration since that time has had an Indian policy.

Tyler (1973) defines Indian Policy as:

> "A course of action pursued by any government and adopted as expedient by that government in its relations with any of the Indians of the Americas....action that is considered by government to be advantageous or advisable under the particular circumstances or during a specific time span."

Origins:

The eventual policies of the United States Government concerning the American Indian had their origins in the first contacts between Europeans and Native Americans, beginning with the Spanish explorations and colonization. The Spanish were followed by the English, the French, and the Dutch, all of whom established Indian policies of some kind. Tyler points out that the United States used the actions of the European colonies in the Americas as precedents in establishing its own policies.

We can find beginnings of official United States Government Indian policy even before Independence was achieved. Benjamin Franklin's plan of 1754 proposed central government control of Indian Affairs.

After independence was won the Articles of Confederation left no doubt that the central government would regulate Indian Affairs and manage Indian trade. Article IX gave the federal government the "exclusive right and power" to regulate trade with Indians and manage Indian affairs as long as the rights of Individual states were not infringed.

The writers of the Constitution provided specific constitutional authority for Federal supervision of Indians. Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 assigned Congress responsibility, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes." In addition, it was established that the Constitution, and all treaties (including treaties with Indian tribes) "shall be the supreme law of the land....anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Indian policy and the administration of it, has been and still is a continually changing phenomenon. The Secretary of War was given responsibility for administration of Indian Affairs in 1786. Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun created, without authorization, what he called the Bureau of Indian Affairs within the War Department in 1824. It wasn't until 1832, however, that a law was passed authorizing the President to appoint a Commissioner of Indian Affairs. In 1849, the office (Bureau) of Indian Affairs was transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior.

During its short history United States Government Indian policies have changed with the times. As the national and international winds changed and shifted Indian policy ranged from:

1. A focus on the civilization and education of Indians, to:
2. Tribal removal and concentration westward, to:
3. The establishment of Reservations for Indian Tribes, to:
4. A policy of dealing with individual Indians and their families rather than tribes (including allotment of land), to:
5. A policy of Tribal reorganization during the New Deal.
6. And again to a policy of Indian relocation and Tribal termination, a policy which has been roundly criticized and condemned by many, Indians and non-Indians alike. The thrust of this policy was to discontinue the special trust relationship between the Federal Government and Indian people.

A New Era:

In the 1960's the cycle of Indian policy again began to turn. Indian Tribes again came to be viewed as decision-making bodies.

By the time Richard M. Nixon became President of the United States the Government's position had moved from a policy of Tribal termination to one of Indian self-determination. President Nixon articulated that policy in his Special Message to Congress on July 8, 1970. He assured Indians that the special relationship between the

Federal Government and Indian Tribes and Communities would be maintained, while at the same time proposing that Indian Communities be allowed to take over control and operation of Federally-funded Indian programs if they so choose. He said:

> "The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions."

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs then announced "a fundamental change in policy" within the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The new policy would provide henceforth for the right and authority of Indian Tribes and communities to take part in the "planning and operation of activities that touch their everyday lives."

On January 4, 1975, President Gerald R. Ford, signed into Law Bill S 1017. As enacted the bill became Public Law 93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

President Ford stated that, "My administration is committed to furthering the self-determination of Indian communities without terminating the special relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian People."

Title I of the Act, according to the President, gives the permanence and stature of law to the objective of allowing and encouraging Indian Tribes to operate programs serving them under contract to the Federal Government. He said:

> "With the passage of this Act Indian Communities and their leaders now share with the Federal Government the responsibility for the full realization of this objective.

> It will be through the initiatives of Indian communities that the authorities provided in this act will be implemented. I urge these communities to make the fullest possible use of them and pledge the support of this Administration."

Title II, the Indian Education Act, gives Indian Communities a stronger role in approving or disapproving the use of federal funds for Indian children attending public schools.

In summary, the President stated that Public Law 93-638 will enable his administration to work more closely and effectively with the tribes for the betterment of all the Indian people by assisting them in meeting goals they themselves have set.

It is as part of this policy of Indian self-determination that the program described in this paper was developed. It was designed as part of the process outlined by President Nixon which would "result in Indian control of federally funded programs at the reservation level, when Indian people inform Government agencies that they are prepared to take control."

III. OBJECTIVES-BASED MANAGEMENT IN GOVERNMENT

For a number of years the Executive Branch of the United States Government has endeavored to establish a management system for decision-making in federal agencies called Management by Objectives (MBO). This system uses theoretical principals of the discipline known as "systems development" or the "systems approach."

In the course of implementing administrative directives to initiate certain management strategies in federal agencies the Department of the Interior established the Secretarial Operational Planning System (OPS). The purpose of this system was to achieve accountability through management by objectives. The point of departure for such a system requires specification of objectives which provide guidance and goals to be achieved by employees of an organization.

Department Level Responsibilities:

The Department of the Interior is made up of a number of Bureaus, each of which is directly responsible to the Secretary of the Interior. Each is required annually to specify its objectives of highest priority, along with an overall approach for accomplishing those objectives.

Offices within the various Bureaus with particular areas of responsibility are in turn called upon to generate priority objectives, plans, and strategies within the "management by objectives" (MBO)

framework. These objectives must, of course, reflect the major policy thrusts of the federal government.

Bureau of Indian Affairs' Responsibilities:

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is a part of the Department of the Interior, with a number of offices which administer services to Indian people. Each of these offices reports to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and each is responsible for the development of priority objectives within its domain. Objectives which are considered to be clearly on target and in keeping with the major aims and goals of United States Government policy are accepted as Secretarial level objectives for the Bureau. A particularly relevant objective....one that is considered especially on target with federal policy....may be elevated to the level of Presidential Objective.

The objective for Indian Education which is the subject of this paper was designated first as a Secretarial objective and subsequently as a Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Fiscal Year 1975.

IV. THE PRESIDENTIAL/SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVE FOR INDIAN EDUCATION: SOME IMPORTANT FACTORS

Self-Determination as Contracting: One Factor

Any approach to problem solving rests on certain assumptions: assumptions about the problem itself as well as the elements involved in it. Often the assumptions held by different people on a given concept will lead to quite different conclusions. In the case of the policy of Indian Self-determination it is apparent that a universally accepted definition has not been established. Assumptions concerning what constitutes self-determination vary greatly, especially regarding the operation of schools serving Indian people.

The language used to articulate official policy centers around the view of "allowing and encouraging Indian Tribes to operate programs serving them under contract to the Federal Government."

Many people and organizations, Indians, politicians, and Government personnel have adopted the assumption that self-determination by Indians is synonymous with contracting by Indian tribes and/or organizations to operate their own programs. In a real sense Education programs led the way in contracting.

Contracting to operate the school serving their Navajo community was undertaken in 1966 by DINE Incorporated at Rough Rock, Arizona. Other "contract" schools have followed in several states. The Federal Government has for several years been encouraging Indian

communities to follow suit. In spite of this encouragement, and the pronouncements of some spokesmen that all federally operated schools would shortly be operated under contract, actual movement in this direction has been slow.

Fuchs and Havighurst (1972) observed that:

> "A problem which may be encountered in certain communities is that some Indian people simply may not wish to be responsible for their own schools. Many Indians feel that the Bureau--or other--schools are quite adequate and may not wish to change. There may be several reasons for this..."

They go on to mention feelings expressed in meetings with Indian people in education conferences of being unprepared for the complex tasks; of the potential problems presented by intra-tribal politics; of cultural differences along "more traditional" as against relatively "more acculturated" lines, among others.

The broad movement toward Indian control of schools their children attend has been a popular theme with Indian and non-Indian social scientists and educators as well as with congressmen. Many Indian people have expressed a desire to have more control over local education programs which has been demonstrated by the formation of Advisory School Boards with no legal basis for making decisions. It is fair to say, however, that they are not at all unanimous in support of undertaking to contract their operation. In education, at least, it could not be assumed that contracting by Indians to run their own schools is synonymous with everyone's concept of self-determination. Self-determination for many Indian people means

the right to continue as a Federally managed school, not just the right to contract.

Indians Attending Public Schools: A second factor

Consideration of an objective for Indian education which would help articulate a policy of self-determination could not ignore the fact that a large majority of Indian children already attend public schools. In some areas of 100 percent Indian or Eskimo enrollment there are already public schools established and operating. It has long been part of Federal policy (which may possibly now be obsolete) ultimately to enroll all Indian children in public schools. This approach was deemed to be essential to providing equal educational opportunity as well as complying with desegregation laws.

The possibility of changing from a Federally managed school to a public school operation is very real in many areas and must be considered a viable option for Indian people. Conversely, Indian people in some states are strongly opposed to State involvement.

Uniqueness of Communities: A Third Factor

In seeking to articulate an objective for Indian education it was apparent that providing Indian people with just one alternative--contracting--to federal management of their schools is just as reprehensible as providing no options. Whatever the number of options, however, it was clear that Indian people would need objective and comprehensive information about all of them in order to be able

to make an informed choice.

The Presidential/Secretarial Objective, as it was finally written, took into account the advice and recommendations of Fuchs and Havighurst, as well as others, that, "the difficulties and possibilities for local Indian control of the schools their children attend vary from community to community." Implementation of a policy of local control must respond to the wishes and concerns of the individual community.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

Educational Objectives for Indians:

From the time Indian policy first appeared in the Americas education has been a factor of considerable importance. Bringing Indians into a civilized state was the most common objective and required a formal education program. Throughout the centuries responsibility for providing education to Indians has varied considerably. Most early education was provided by religious orders, initially by the Catholic church in most countries, including what is now the Southwestern United States. Many other religious denominations have followed. Eventually most Governments took on that responsibility in some degree.

Objectives for learners in schools are integral to the system. It should not be surprising that most objectives for Indians in the United States for a long time viewed religious conversion as the most important educational outcome to be sought. In time it became evident that education programs for Indian children were the responsibility of the Federal Government, required by treaty. Education programs, along with other services were to be provided within the framework of a trust relationship.

A long history of the development of educational objectives for Indians in Federally operated schools began. Over the years many on-going efforts by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to spell out

educational objectives for Indians can be traced. Most of these were probably sincere attempts at meaningfulness and relevance. However, increasing focus on the importance of cultural identity, cultural differences and special needs of minorities in our society in recent years has required that these concepts be redefined.

Many easy references have been made to the need to provide more 'meaningful and relevant' educational programs for Indians, but the task remains very complex. Fuchs and Havighurst (pp 306. 1972) concluded that:

> "It is difficult and perhaps impossible to state what Indians want their children to get from the schools <u>as Indians</u>. In the first place, various Indian groups have different desires in this respect. For example, the thirty thousand Lumbees of North Carolina have lost their traditional language and now use English: They do not practice a traditional culture although they have pride in being Indian. They contrast enormously with the Navajo, who have a living language, living myths and religious ceremonies, and a vital tribal life which they wish their children to retain.
>
> Secondly, many tribes are divided among themselves concerning their expectations of the school as a teacher of Indian culture and history. Among the Hopi, for instance, one faction would limit the school to teaching the English language and other skills necessary to do business in the outer world, while the tribe teaches the children their culture. Another faction would use the schools more fully to carry on the Hopi culture.
>
> Non-Indians cannot usefully help to settle this kind of problem. Indians will work it out, and the schools, especially those on and near reservations, should follow the Indian voice."

It is precisely this view that was taken by the Office of Indian Education Programs in the articulation of the Objective which was accepted at the Secretarial as well as the Presidential level in 1974.

The Objective:

"By the end of Fiscal Year 1975 at least one-fourth (50) of the Bureau schools will operate under the management system chosen by those served by the school."

This Objective statement establishes several important points.

1. Indian people are to decide for themselves which management arrangement (from all possible arrangements) they prefer for the federally operated schools their children now attend.
2. The selection of a management system of their choice applies to the approximately 200 schools currently operated by the federal government through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The federal government does not have jurisdiction over public schools or parochial schools, and schools that are now operated by Indian organizations under contract with the federal government already reflect decisions by Indian people in keeping with the objective.
3. There is no one option mentioned in the objective, nor is it intended that any particular option receive

emphasis above any other among the alternative management systems Indian people might examine.

The Departmental Manual of the Department of the Interior spells out procedures and requirements for implementation of the Secretarial Operational Planning System. One requirement calls for the designation of an overall project manager. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in compliance with that requirement, designated Central Office Program Directors as Project Managers, and thus the Director of the Office of Indian Education Programs became Project Manager for the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective in Education.

Approach:

The Objective statement merely states what was intended to be accomplished within a specified time-frame. It was obvious that choosing a management system was not a simple matter in which all necessary information was already available to Indian people for reaching a sound decision. Neither was the information available from any single source in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, yet Indian people would need objective and comprehensive information in order to truly weigh the alternative school management systems.

In addition to the lack of centrally available information in manageable form there remained the extremely complex problem of delivering and presenting it to very diverse populations. These populations range from non-English speaking rural, isolated people such as Alaskan Natives, Navajos, and others, to quite sophisticated

and urban monolingual English-speaking people in places like Oklahoma and North Carolina Cherokees. The complete Objective statement, then, in outlining the approach to be taken, specified certain broad areas of responsibility:

1. By May 30, 1974, the Office of Indian Education Programs will develop a training package which will be designed to help a school board, staff, students, parents, tribal leaders, and others concerned assess their school's programs and needs, and to understand the management options which are available for operating that school; i.e., continued Bureau operation, operating as a public school, contracting with the government to operate the school (or part of it), etc.
2. During June, 1974, Central Office staff will explain the objective and the use of the training materials to each Area Office (BIA) in which schools are operated (by the BIA).
3. The nine Area Offices of the BIA in which schools are operated were asked to develop schedules by June 15, 1974, for making presentations to tribal groups, school boards, and local communities explaining the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective and inviting their interest, participation and study of school management options.

4. Area Offices were to make a total of 100 presentations during FY 1975 to tribal groups, and through the tribes to local communities and school boards as a means of preparing one-fourth (50) of the Bureau's schools to undertake a comprehensive needs assessment resulting in preparation of tribal and/or school board resolutions on their choice of a management system for the continued operation of the school.

5. The people served by all schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs will review and determine the management system for that school, including the various options and alternatives available to upgrade, change and innovate education programs for Indian children, through a series of meetings of tribal and community representatives and bureau of Indian Affairs Area and Agency officials.

Thus Program development toward attainment of the Educational Objective was viewed mainly as a responsibility to provide information. The major tasks were: 1) To gather and package that information, and, 2) Make that information available to Indian people.

Decisions reached by Indians on the best school management system for meeting the needs of their children must be informed decisions. To make an informed decision about the best management system for their school Indian people would need comprehensive, objective, and reliable information. The approach used viewed the overall

responsibility of the Office of Indian Education Programs as instructional; as a teaching-learning situation of considerable complexity requiring the development of instructional products and strategies which could convey basic information needed for decision-making in a variety of situations; and which would incorporate basic teaching-learning principles.

VI. OPERATING ROLES

Management by objectives requires that major tasks and key responsibilities be articulated and assigned. In the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Office of education programs those tasks and assignments were necessary at two levels; the Central Office, which includes both Washington, D. C. and Albuquerque offices, and the several Area offices of the BIA in which schools are operated.

The first major task responsibility of the Central Office of Indian Education Programs was for the development of the overall (Bureau-wide) operating plan. This was started in early April, 1974, and was derived partially from the proceedings of planning meetings held in Albuquerque, N. M.. These meetings were chaired by Central Office staff and involved both Central Office and Area Office education personnel. The primary concerns of these meetings were the identification of school management options available to Indian people, and the specification of general information categories for describing any or all options. Altogether, this information comprised the content for the informational package required to be developed by the Central Office. The most challenging task would be the delivery of that information to Indian and Alaskan Native people.

A planning format was adopted at the outset for use by both Central Office and Area Office personnel. This format is similar

to many developed in systems planning, and in addition to identification of major tasks and designation of a "lead person" responsible for each task, the format calls for projection of the time frame within which the task is to be accomplished. Projection of key actions or decisions and identification of decision-makers is required as well as regular updating and revision in light of actual versus planned accomplishments.

The Bureau-wide operating plan specified the following major tasks and responsibilities:

Task	Responsibility
Develop overall strategy	Central Office
Develop informational package	Central Office
Development and implementation of a monitoring process to provide regular feedback on presentations to Indian tribal and community groups and related actions.	Central Office
Preparation of Area Offices for implementation.	Central Office
Designation of Area Office Project Manager	Area Office
Development of Area Office operating plan.	Area Office Project Manager
Presentations to tribal groups, (Tribal Council, school boards, Indian communities.)	Area Office
Conduct Needs Assessments	Agency Offices
Resolution expressing choice of school	Official tribal or village

Management System	Tribal governing body
Installation of system selected	Area Directors

It should be noted that each of these major tasks required the specification of numerous sub-tasks, or en-route objectives for their accomplishment. A number of fairly sophisticated competencies and skills are needed in order to envision the sequence of actions and communications which together will result in progress toward specified objectives. These competencies include attention to seemingly trivial or minor details, and the awareness of their importance in the composite. It became evident early in the year that there were differences between Area offices in availability of these essential competencies and talents which directly affect the program's potential.

VII. PARTICIPATING AREA OFFICES

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is organized administratively into twelve Areas which sometimes encompass parts of two or more states. These Areas are usually designated by the name of the city in which the administrative offices are located. Thus we have the Aberdeen Area office located in Aberdeen, South Dakota; the Albuquerque, Anandarko (Oklahoma), Billings, Juneau, Minneapolis, Muskogee, Phoenix, Portland, and Sacramento Area Offices. The Navajo Area Office is located at Window Rock, Arizona, while the Southeastern Agencies have their administrative headquarters in Washington, D. C..

Several Areas have either never had federally operated schools or no longer have them at this time, and were therefore not included in the Bureau-wide project for implementation of the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective for Indian control of education in BIA schools. Those not participating in the project are the Billings, Minneapolis, and Sacramento Areas.

The Portland Area operates only one school at this time. Chemawa is an off-reservation boarding high school located near Salem, Oregon. Off-reservation boarding schools have been losing enrollment as education facilities have increased on or near Reservations. Off-reservation boarding schools present complex problems in decision-making by Indians since they enroll students

from many tribes and locations, and the school board membership is drawn from across the service areas. It was felt, however, that every effort should be made to include off-reservation boarding schools in the project since they continue in operation and Indian people have expressed the need for their continuation.

Each area is unique in terms of geography, as well as cultural, socio-economic, and linguistic factors. For example, while the Juneau Area, which encompasses the entire state of Alaska, serves a rural, widely scattered and isolated population as does the Navajo Area, there are major differences in climate and life style which have resulted in distinct school operation patterns. The Bureau of Indian Affairs operates day schools in Alaskan Native Villages. The village life style lends itself well to this arrangement. The Navajo, on the other hand, live in family camps, usually quite remote from one another as well as from population and trade centers, and this pattern has resulted in the construction and operation of numerous elementary boarding schools as well as boarding high schools on the Reservation, complete with on-site staff housing.

Each Area represents efforts over many years to adopt schooling arrangements which accomodate the particular needs of the population being served, and while much has been said about inadequacies and failures of the system, schools are available to all Indian and Native Alaskan children and the vast majority are enrolled in school.

The great differences between Areas serves to point out a major difficulty in the development of materials intended to inform Native populations in general, as well as in the development of strategies for presenting information at the local level. It was apparent at the outset that not all information about each school management option would be equally applicable to all locations, and it was agreed that each option should be presented in a separate packaged program which could then be used independently where most applicable or left out if not appropriate.

Strategies for presenting information and answering questions at the local level about the Objective and the available options had to be developed. The view was adopted that each Area Office is best informed and most knowledgeable about Area tribal or village organizations and operations, schools and school boards, communities and their relationships with one another, etc., and therefore best able to develop plans and schedules.

VIII. THE INFORMATIONAL PACKAGE

Several media possibilities were considered through which to present information on school management options. Criteria of attractiveness and portability pointed to the use of the 35 mm filmstrips with accompanying audio tape as the most useful medium. A seven program series was developed by the Central Office of Indian education programs to present information on various management options.

A Brief Overview of the Informational Package:

Each of the seven programs in the series provides specific information which should be useful to Indian people in examining school management options and in deciding which system might best meet their needs.

Program Number 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES: MANAGEMENT DECISIONS IN INDIAN EDUCATION. (20 Minutes)

a. Presents and explains the Presidential/Secretarial Objective.

b. Briefly introduces the seven parts of the series.

c. States the intended behavioral outcomes for this part. (This is done in each of the seven parts.)

d. Explains the roles of the Central, Area, and Agency Offices of the BIA, and of Indian Tribes, school boards, and communities in implementation of the Objective.

e. Emphasizes that Indian communities have options for the management of their local BIA operated schools.

f. Briefly explains five possible school management options and nine basic information categories through which Indian communities may view those options.
(Note: the last is called simply "The fifth option", which represents possible new ideas which haven't been developed or tried yet.)

Program Number 2. SELECTING EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND ASSESSING EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (30 Minutes)

a. Explains the need and the importance to the community of conducting an educational needs assessment.

b. Presents a step by step method for accomplishing an educational needs assessment and selecting educational goals for a community.

c. Emphasizes the need for making an informed choice--determining what option the community feels will best meet the needs identified.

d. Explains how to conduct a general evaluation of the school.

e. Explains what to do after the educational needs assessment has been completed and goals have been selected.

f. Describes assistance that can be provided by the BIA school staff, and Agency, Area, and Central Office personnel.

Program Number 3. THE FEDERAL SCHOOL: A MANAGEMENT OPTION (45 Minutes)

a. Explains the legal basis for the establishment and operation of a Federal School System and a brief history of it.

b. Explains eligibility for attending Federal Schools.

c. Discusses the budget process of the Federal System.

d. Discusses legal responsibility for policy determination for Federal schools and how it is delegated.

e. Discusses Indian parental involvement in the operation of Federal schools: advisory school boards, PTO, community meetings, etc.

f. Discusses responsibility for curriculum, administration, staffing, teacher certification, fringe benefits, food service, transportation, plant operation and maintenance, school construction, housing, and accountability in the Federal School system.

Program Number 4. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL: A MANAGEMENT OPTION (50 Minutes)

a. Explains legal requirements and implications of changing from a Federal to a Public school system.

b. Discusses the history and background of the American Public School System.

c. Discusses laws governing public schools and their relationship to Indian students (State Laws, Federal laws e.g. Public Law 874, P.L. 815, Titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, etc.)

d Discusses budgeting process and funding sources for public schools: Taxes, state and federal funds, etc.

e. Discusses standards established for public schools, teacher certification, etc.

f. Discusses the role of the State Department of Public Instruction.

g. Discusses the authority and responsibility of the local elected school board and its relationship to advisory boards.

h. Discusses responsibility in the public school for establishing of goals and objectives, curriculum, evaluation, administration, staffing, salary schedule, personnel and student policies, support services, plant management, etc.

i. Explains procedures for turning a federally operated school into a public school: cautions that the procedure may not be the same everywhere depending on the particular state.

j. Discusses the relationship between the school board and the school administrator.

k. Cautions that Indian people must actively seek school board membership in order to control a public school operation.

Program Number 5. THE TRIBAL-PRIVATE SCHOOL: A MANAGEMENT OPTION (45 Minutes)

a. Normally called a Contract school, with the BIA providing funds through a cost-reimbursable contract.

b. Discusses the legal bases for contracting of school operations with Indian organizations.

c. Discusses the history of contracting.

d. Discusses the BIA's mission to assist tribes in developing contracts.

e. Discusses steps in negotiating a school contract.

f. Discusses funding levels for contracting, and sources of supplemental funding.

g. Discusses responsibility and authority for establishing goals and objectives of education in a contract school.

h. Explains definite educational work requirements and conditions the school program must meet.

i. Discusses state codes, accreditation, decisions by the community, and responsibility of local school boards.

j. Discusses responsibility and authority for hiring, administration, staffing, curriculum, support services, etc.

Program Number 6. THE COMBINATION SCHOOL: A MANAGEMENT OPTION (15 Minutes)

a. Explains cooperative plans that may be developed between public, federal, and tribal-contract schools, or any combination of these.

b. Discusses some basic management structures that are already in operation.

c. Presents examples of existing combination school operations.

d. Refers back to other options for general information on actual school management in a particular combination.

e. Discusses the importance of consulting state laws concerning possibility of a particular combination.

Program Number 7. ANOTHER LOOK: ITS YOUR MOVE (15 Minutes)

a. Reviews the first 6 tapes, with a short recap of each of the school management options.

b. Briefly compares the information categories (Funding, legal basis, responsibility for goals, staffing, etc.) across options.

c. Advises Indian communities to review all of the programs but to seek additional information about any or all school management options, especially those of particular interest.

d. Tells Indian Communities that they will determine how they want their schools managed, but doing so requires that they study the alternatives seriously and select the one which best meets their needs.

e. Explains that doing nothing also results in a decision—to leave things as they are--but it won't be an informed decision based on weighing the alternatives nor will it reflect Indian control of their own affairs.

It should be emphasized again that the seven program series provides information which is generally applicable throughout the Bureau, but may differ in particulars in many specific situations. There should be no mistaking the fact that all options are not equally feasible in all situations, and it is clearly necessary that the user of the informational series use his best judgment on whether to use or eliminate any part, or even whether to use the package at all. In some instances it has been used primarily for the training of BIA or Tribal staff members in preparation for presentations which they themselves design. In other situations a program of particular interest has been translated into the language of the community and that audio tape used with the filmstrip.

There is no restriction by the Office of Indian Education Programs on how the materials may be used, including complete modification or tailoring to better serve local needs. The only purpose in their development was to provide as much useful and objective information to Indian people as possible to assist them in considering how they want a critical service managed; the education of their children.

IX. PLANS AND STRATEGIES

The overall plan for accomplishing the Presidential/Secretarial objective was devised by the Central Office of Indian Education Programs. This plan called for individual Area level plans and strategies as well as assignment of project managers in presenting school management options to Indian people.

Each of the participating Areas submitted a plan specifying contact and presentation key communications and other tasks. The Central Office in turn visited each Area Office to provide training and assistance.

In several Area Offices personnel from other than education services participated in viewing the informational program series as in-service training. Not all designated participating offices were equally energetic and effective, of course, but initial enthusiasm and activity were quite high in several areas. Several meetings of project managers were held with the Director of Education to review progress and amend plans as needed. The meeting held in the Director's Office on October 31 and November 1, 1974 was particularly significant for the project. This review and critique was attended by project staff of the Central Office of Education, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and members of his staff, and staff members of the Department of Interior and the Office of Management and the Budget.

During the course of this meeting the Office of Education Programs was asked to place additional emphasis on the Objective; to increase the level of activity; to strengthen the reporting process; and to insure that work toward the Objective would be given high priority at all levels.

It was at this time also that the language of the Objective itself was reviewed and revisions recommended.

X. THE OBJECTIVE IS REVISED

The Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Indian Education in its original form, stated that "By the end of FY 1975 at least one-fourth (50) of the Bureau Schools will operate under the management system chosen by those served by the school."

Two problems were encountered in early work toward accomplishing the Objective. The first problem centered on the words "will operate" by the end of FY 1975.

Of the known school management options open to Indian people only one could possibly have been operational within the designated time frame. That option would be, of course, a decision to continue as a Federally operated school. Selection of any other option would require a great deal of preparation time. A decision to contract the operation of a school, for example, would require a January starting time in accordance with the Bureau of Indian Affairs Manual. In most cases there could not have been enough time for communities to conduct a careful study and still meet that requirement. For this reason the language was changed from "will operate" to "A choice of the Management System will be made" in FY 1975. It was felt that this change made the Objective more reasonable and attainable.

The second problem involving the language of the Objective derived from the phrase "Chosen by those served by the school."

This phrase was further defined in the approach, which stated that "The Tribes and/or school boards of each of the fifty schools will be asked to prepare a resolution on their choice of a management system." The approach also specified that BIA Area Office presentations would be made to "tribal groups, and through the tribe to local communities and school boards." While this seemed clearly to recognize the tribe as the decision-making body, in actuality decision-making roles concerning the Objective were interpreted differently in various areas. Considerable sensitivity developed in several situations concerning decision-making and official decision-making roles and procedures. In some instances a Tribal Chairman and/or Tribal Council made it clear that, while school boards might review alternatives any decisions would be the domain of the official governing body.

This was, of course, in keeping with the language of the Objective. It was apparent, however, that recognition of the Tribal Government as the official decision-making body needed to be stated more explicitly. To accomplish this clarification and to take care of the first problem the Objective was revised to read as follows:

> "By the end of FY 1975, in at least one-fourth (50) of the Bureau Schools, by official action of a Tribal or Alaskan Village Government, a choice of the Management System will be made by those served by the schools."

The new statement required that Tribal governing bodies be consulted first and continuously and limited intended outcomes to the selection of a management system in FY 1975 as opposed to installing that system within that time.

XI. FY 1975 IN RETROSPECT

The overall strategy designed to carry out the Presidential/Secretarial Objective included a monitoring system. The monitoring system in objectives-based management provides essential feedback to decision-makers concerning progress (or lack of it) and signals the need to modify strategies and plans from time to time.

The monitoring system for the Presidential/Secretarial Objective included weekly telephone reports to the Central Office Monitor. The Monitor was primarily concerned with those tasks which were projected in an area plan but were not being accomplished.

Monthly written reports from Area Project Managers as well as the quarterly meetings of project personnel were also components of the monitoring system.

The Central Office of Indian Education Programs has reported progress information at regular intervals through its Research and Evaluation Report Series 29.00. Six Reports have been prepared and distributed to date by the Division of Evaluation, Research, and Development of the IERC (Indian Education Resources Center), located in Albuquerque, New Mexico. All reports are available upon request.

Report number 29.05 presents summary data on the Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Fiscal Year 1975. This data is presented for the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a whole as well as for individual areas participating in the Objective.

The report reveals that a total of 78 federally operated schools were designated by Area Offices as participating in the project. This number represents 39 percent of the total of 200 schools currently operated by the BIA.

Of the 78 schools participating in the project the Report indicates that 48 or 62% received complete presentations of information concerning school management options. Only ten official tribal resolutions are reported, although 68 (87%) are indicated as having selected a preferred management option. Of those 68 schools 63 have elected to remain under BIA management while 2 have selected the Tribal-private management option and 3 have chosen to become public schools.

The Objective specified that selections of management systems would be made by official tribal resolution. This part of the Objective has seemingly been most difficult to obtain. In general, tribes have taken the view that no one asked them for an official preference in the past and they see no reason to make one now. In addition, many take the position that self-determination means, among other things, the right not to make a decision.

In some cases tribal councils and individuals have expressed some dismay over being asked to consider all options and have wanted to know why the Bureau of Indian Affairs is trying to get rid of them. The feeling in such instances is that they long ago made it evident (though not formally) that they want the BIA to operate their school, and they see no reason to consider any other possibility.

Still other Areas have reacted strongly to even the requests to present information on management options. In these situations the suspicion has been expressed that the Objective is really intended to trick Indians into contracting, which is viewed as another avenue to termination.

A brief description of each Area and Project activities within it will help provide the reader a view of the status of the project as well as its complexity.

First, of course, several BIA Area Offices may be skipped over since they do not operate schools. The Minneapolis and Sacramento Areas have never operated schools. The Billings Area still operated one boarding school at Busby, Montana as recently as 1971, but operation of this school has been contracted by the Northern Cheyenne tribe since that time.

The Aberdeen Area Office of the BIA administers programs for Indians in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska. There is a total of 32 federally operated schools in the Area, six of which are boarding schools. Almost all of the day schools in the Aberdeen Area operate in actuality on some kind of combination basis. That is, in order to provide educational programs for non-Indian children in large, remote, sparsely populated areas accomodations have been reached between state and federal governments over the years whereby public school districts and federally operated schools combine resources.

This Area actually provides the model for the combination school option in the Presidential/Secretarial objective.

The project management in FY 1975 in the Aberdeen Area was among the most vigorous. Presentations have been made at all 15 participating schools and presentations have been fully completed at eight of the schools. Fourteen schools have elected to remain under federal management while one, an off Reservation boarding school, has chosen to contract its management. An anomoly in this Area is that most of the schools already operate on less than full federal management, yet are still considered by the Federal Government to be federally operated schools.

Tribal governments have thus far been less than receptive to the idea of contracting by school boards although a number have expressed desire to do so. At the same time, the possibility of operating as a public school has thus far been given little consideration by boards or councils, especially in South Dakota. The Indian people feel they would have no chance to control their schools if they were to enter the state system.

The Albuquerque Area Office operates a total of 14 schools, two of which are off-reservation boarding schools. Four schools were designated to participate in the P/SO project, including the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico. One Pueblo elected to contract to operate its school, a completely new plant, only to have the decision reversed in a later council meeting. All

participating schools in this Area have chosen to continue as federally operated schools to date.

The Anadarko Area Office covers Central Oklahoma. Five off-reservation boarding schools are administered by this office, including the Haskell Indian Junior College at Lawrence, Kansas. The Area education personnel have found the advisory boards of these schools opposed to considering options for school management other than continuation as federal schools. All five have indicated they want to continue under BIA management.

The Muskogee Area in Eastern Oklahoma administers two boarding schools. As in the Anadarko Area, Area staff report that the school boards have stated they are not interested in considering other management options. No presentations have been accomplished. As in other Areas where the only federally operated schools are Off-Reservation boarding schools the enrollment reflects many tribes in several states. Management decisions by tribes of those served are difficult to reach.

The Eastern Area of the BIA includes the operation of schools for Choctaw, Cherokee, Seminole, and Miccosukee Indians in Mississippi, North Carolina and Florida.

The Cherokee community stated at the outset that it was not interested in hearing about management options, preferring to remain under BIA Management.

The Choctaw Tribe in Philadelphia, Mississippi, has entertained the possibility of operating its schools under contract for several

years. Each effort has failed to win the necessary community referendum and at this time the decision is to remain under federal management. The Miccosukee school in Florida already operates under contract while the Seminole remains under federal operation.

The Navajo Area Office operates the largest number of schools in the BIA. The Area encompasses the Northeast Corner of Arizona and the Northwest Corner of New Mexico plus a narrow Southern strip of the state of Utah. The total number of schools is almost evenly divided between Arizona and New Mexico, with Arizona having a slight edge.

Of the total of 60 schools 50 are boarding facilities. Most of these school plants were built after World War II, and the number now includes three high schools.

At the time the Presidential/Secretarial Objective was introduced local Navajo School Boards expressed considerable interest in learning about management options. Indian Community control of schools was first introduced on the Navajo Reservation at Rough Rock Demonstration School in 1966 attracting National and International attention. There was reason to believe that many Navajo people were now interested in considering alternative school management possibilities.

Participation by Navajo Area Schools was short lived, however. Competing offices within the Tribal Government concerning educational matters soon produced criticism of the objective and the approach

taken by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Coupled with distrust of the motives of the Federal Government in encouraging the contracting of other programs, the entire effort was quickly halted. The Chairman of the Navajo Tribe requested from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs a two year moratorium in the implementation of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. The request was granted, and there has been no further effort to present management options information to Navajo people.

The Juneau Area Office administers the second largest number of schools in the BIA. Its jurisdiction covers the entire state. As opposed to the Navajo Area, where a majority are boarding schools, 53 of 55 schools in the Juneau Area are day schools.

The matter of local control of schools in Alaska is affected by factors not found elsewhere in the BIA. One of the most significant of these is the newness of the State itself. Another is the fact that Alaskan Natives do not live on Reservations as is the case with most recognized tribes. Suffice it to say that the Alaskan situation is unique and dynamic, which supports the approach of placing decision-making as close as possible to the tribal/community level of operations.

The State of Alaska is moving toward a consolidation of education under its administration throughout the state. For this reason, the State feels that contracting as a management option by Native groups is not in the best interest of Alaskan education. There has,

however, been cooperation and communication between the BIA Area Office and the State Department of Education on implementation of the objective.

Seventeen schools were designated as participants in implementation of the Objective. Complete presentations were made to thirteen of the villages, and four official resolutions were prepared electing to change from federal management. Three of the four have chosen to become public schools while one will contract to operate as a Native-Private school. Nine schools have informally decided to continue as federally operated schools pending further study.

The Phoenix Area of the BIA administers twenty-two schools, seven of which are boarding facilities. The Area Education Office has been among the most active in planning and implementation of the Objective. All twenty-two schools have chosen to continue as federally operated schools. As with many schools in other Areas the position expressed is that, "we reserve the right not to make a decision."

The last Area in which a federally operated school is administered has its office in Portland, Oregon. As stated earlier, they administer only one boarding high school. In the past the school has drawn a sizeable share of its enrollment from Alaska. This is no longer the case. Alaskans are now going to high school within the state, either the one federally operated boarding school, or state operated high schools.

The Portland Area Office initially elected not to participate in the project to implement the Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Education. At midyear presentations were made to Area personnel and to the school board. There has been no reported effort to reach the tribal organizations which are served by the school.

XII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Indian Education for Fiscal Year 1975 was a seemingly honest attempt by the federal government of the United States to say to Indian people; "Tell us how you want your schools to be managed and that's the way it will be. We will help you examine all possible options."

This approach attempted to avoid appearances of seeking a predetermined verdict. Objective and reasonably comprehensive information on all possible options was gathered, packaged, and disseminated widely. No one option was promoted. The only thing requested of Indian Tribes, communities, and school boards was an interest in examining and comparing management options in order to knowledgeably select the one which best meets their needs.

The results of the year's efforts have been less than hoped for. The objective implementation is being evaluated by two non-Government Indian-owned organizations. Several observations can be made at this time concerning planning, activities, and progress to date as well as the present and future status of the objective.

Why Do We Have To Decide Anything?

The response by Indian Tribes and organizations has, in a number of cases, borne out the observations of Fuchs and Havighurst quoted earlier in this paper.

The Objective asks Indians to consider all possible school management systems and to select the one best suiting their needs. This implies possible change. There are many Indian communities that simply are satisfied with existing arrangements. In some cases they feel they are not ready to undertake the task themselves. In other cases they genuinely want federal management to continue as their preferred management option.

The point to be made, however, is that such decisions are entirely within the framework of the Objective, but there has thus far been a reluctance to determine the preferences of the community or tribe and to make a formal statement to that effect.

This points up a basic problem the Government will encounter with any Objectives it may develop which are intended to lead to self-determination by Indians. Evaluators have found the planning of the project and the quality of the informational series to be of generally high quality. The intent seems to be to follow the wishes of Indian and Native Alaskan people regarding management of their schools. Yet when outcomes are to be reflected in a voluntary, formal action there is no way that the Government can make people take that action if they simply don't want to or don't see the need for it. The right not to choose is part of another definition of self-determination.

Any Government Plan is Suspect:

A persistent problem for the Educational Objective, as stated earlier, has been the concurrent emphasis in Objectives for other service programs on just one option, contracting by Indians for their operation. Regardless of assurances that the Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Education was not limited to one or even two options the suspicion remains widespread that 1) Contracting of schools is the real underlying objective, and 2) Contracting is really an avenue toward termination. The "Termination psychosis" described by Fuchs and Havighurst is very much alive.

An important question in regard to the Objective has consistently been, "What happens if we decide to change from a federal operation and then find we want to return? Will you take us back?" This kind of situation has come to be called retrocession, and the Government has assured Indians that it will take back management responsibilities if asked to do so. There are, however, many questions remaining about just how this would happen. Questions of Civil Service employment ceilings, among others, will have to be answered in order for the affirmative response to be convincing.

The Future of the Objective:

Many unforeseen obstacles to the implementation of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective were encountered in Fiscal Year 1975, yet there are indications that the basic approach is a viable one.

There are many indications that Indian people will indeed want to determine how their schools will be managed, but will require a more gradual approach to the task. The Office of Indian Education Programs has extended the objective through 1976 on just that premise. In addition to the seventy-eight schools participating in the project in FY 1975 thirty have been added for FY 1976.

The Division of Evaluation, Research, and Development continues to make available the seven program series, Management Decisions in Indian Education, to whomever may wish to avail themselves of it.

Research and Evaluation Report Series Number 29.05 describes the approach as follows:

> "The continuation of the project into Fiscal Year 1976 will allow additional Bureau schools to participate in the Objective and will allow a more gradual transition period for those schools already identified with the Objective. "Gradual Approach" means that a tribe could implement its management choice by assuming any part of the school's operation and ultimately assuming total school operations if that is their wish."

The project to implement the Presidential/Secretarial Objective for education points out a major need in seeking an operational definition for Indian self-determination. Efforts by the Government, which is committed to the policy of self-determination without termination of its trust responsibility, will not in themselves provide that definition. Those efforts must now be continued as on-going readiness to assist as Indian and Native Alaskan people seek to define the concept for themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fuchs, Estelle and Robert J. Havighurst. To Live On This Earth. Garden City. Doubleday and Company. 1972.

Bureau of Indian Affairs: Office of Indian Education Program. Statistics Concerning Indian Education. Lawrence, Kansas. Haskell Press. 1974.

Indian Education Resources Center. Office of Indian Education Programs, BIA. Research and Evaluation Report Series 29.00 through 29.06. Albuquerque. 1974-75.

Streiff, Paul R. Decisions in Education for Indians (7 Part Filmstrip/ Tape Series) IERC. Series Nos. 32.00-32.08. Albuquerque. 1974.

Tyler, S. Lyman A History of Indian Policy. Washington. U. S. Government Printing Office. 1973.

United States Senate. Public Law 93-638. The Indian Self-Determination and Education Act. Washington. U. S. Government Printing Office. 1975.